

City of Burien, Washington

Shoreline Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, September 10, 2008, 4:00 – 6:00 pm

Burien City Hall, 15811 Ambaum Blvd. SW, Suite C
(206) 241-4647

MEETING # 4

- (1) SIGN IN/ROLL CALL - (5 min.)
- (2) CONFIRM AGENDA - (5 min.)
- (3) REVIEW AND APPROVE MEETING #3 SUMMARY - (5 min.)
- (4) SHORELINE GOALS AND POLICIES, Continued DISCUSSION - (1 hr, 15 min.)
 1. Working Session
- (5) SHORELINE DESIGNATIONS (25 min.)
- (6) NEXT MEETING - (5 min.)

TENTATIVE DATE: Wednesday, February 11, 2009, 4:00 - 6:00 pm:
Shoreline Advisory Committee Meeting # 5
Burien City Hall
15811 Ambaum Blvd. SW, Suite C

1. The purpose of this study is to

investigate the relationship between

the variables of interest in this study.

2. The study was conducted in a laboratory setting

using the following methods:

3. The data were collected from a sample of 100 subjects
who were randomly selected from a population of 1000 subjects.
The subjects were divided into two groups: a control group and an experimental group.
The control group consisted of 50 subjects, and the experimental group consisted of 50 subjects.

4. The results of the study showed that there was a significant difference between the two groups.
The experimental group showed a significantly higher mean score than the control group.
This suggests that the treatment had a positive effect on the outcome variable.

City of Burien, Washington

Shoreline Advisory Committee

DRAFT **Meeting #3 Summary**

July 9, 2008
4:00pm

(1) ATTENDANCE

SAC Members present	Technical Staff Present	Interested Parties Present
Brian Bennett Jim Branson Cyrilla Cook Joë Fitzgibbon Victoria Hall Patrick Haugen David Johanson Emelie McNett Lee Moyer Kim Otto Don Warren Joe Weiss	Mark Daniel Liz Ockwell	

(2) CONFIRM AGENDA

1. The agenda was confirmed

(3) REVIEW AND APPROVE MEETING #2 SUMMARY

1. The meeting summary was accepted as presented

(4) SHORELINE GOALS AND POLICIES, Continued DISCUSSION

1. Shoreline Master Program Public Access Element (Continued)
 - RE: PS 3.3, "It's okay to walk on beach"
 - Clarified the comment by a beach owner that they had no problem with people walking on the beach
 - Existing Burien public access goals and policies okay
 - Statements against and for public access at Lake Burien
 - Support for dispersed shoreline public access areas to make it possible for those that live to nearby the shoreline to access it
 - More public access points would upset property owners

- *Potential policy:* Modification of Burien Comp. Plan Policy SA 1.4, The City should seek opportunities to develop new public access areas in locations dispersed throughout the shoreline through: a. tax-title properties; b. donations of land and waterfront areas; and c. acquisition using grants and bonds.
 - Idea of making private beaches available to the public on a designated schedule
2. Shoreline Master Program Recreational Element
- RE: PS 3.1, "Boat launch should be at Seahurst Park"
 - King County had plans for marina here, environmental study dissuaded county
 - *Consensus:* Access for motorized vessels should be discouraged at Seahurst Park, non-motorized craft should be considered if can be done environmentally-sensitive manner
 - Is there some economic advantage to allowing access at the park?
 - Does Burien have ordinances that prevent the launching of non-motorized craft at swimming beaches?
 - Combine recreation element with public access element?
 - Discussion regarding private boat ramps, including possible policies for the removal or modification
 - No new ramps into the tidelands should be allowed.
 - Ramps beyond repair should be removed
 - Low impact ramps (rails) may be ok
 - Development of rec. uses should not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function (other goals number 8) is good.
 - Discussion regarding buoy installation in front of Seahurst Park to park motorized crafts – non-motorized crafts could then come into park for recreation.
3. Shoreline Master Program Circulation Element
- *Consensus:* Public transportation should provide service to public access locations in the shoreline
 - *Consensus:* The shoreline, including that part of it which extends to mid-channel, should not be used for the siting of cross-Sound bridges
 - Pedestrian and bike plan outlines plans for pedestrians and bicycles in the shoreline area

1-296

4. Shoreline Master Program Use Element


- *Consensus:* RE: SAC 3, "Septic Systems and their affect on the shoreline," septic systems should be discouraged and removed, consider using incentives to encourage removal
- RE: Buoys
 - Questions regarding permitting buoys
 - *Consensus:* Buoys, in general, are beneficial—however, should develop policy to ensure that possible negative effects on physical and visual environments are avoided.
- Include language about minimizing commercial boat wakes
- City should develop policy regarding how to manage the shoreline—especially shoreline stabilization structures—and consider impacts of climate change/sea-level rise
- Bulkheads should not impact sediment transport to and along the beach
- City should have development standards that promote the siting of new structures such that they will not require a bulkhead in the future

(5) NEXT MEETING

1. The next meeting will be held on September 10. A draft set of Burien goals and policies will be distributed to the committee well in advance of that meeting for review.

The meeting concluded at 6pm.

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON
MEMORANDUM**

DATE: August 14, 2008
TO: Burien Shoreline Advisory Committee
FROM: David Johanson, AICP, Senior Planner 
SUBJECT: Burien Shoreline Master Program Goals and Policies Preliminary DRAFT Discussion

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Shoreline Advisory Committee a DRAFT of the proposed shoreline master program goals and policies. Our objective is to reach a consensus on the goals and policies.

BACKGROUND

The Shoreline Advisory Committee held a discussion on March 12, 2008, to explore and list issues and opportunities for Burien's shorelines. On May 14, 2008, the City hosted an open house at which all participants were asked to list their issues and opportunities. These conversations served as the starting point and basis for initiating the policy discussion.

At your June 11, 2008 meeting the committee started discussing the issues and opportunity statements from both the Shoreline Advisory Committee discussion and community open house. It was determined that another meeting was needed to work through each of the master program elements and to adequately discuss all the subject areas identified in previous meetings. At your July 9, 2008 meeting the committee continued the discussions to formulate the goals and policy section however the group fell just short of discussing each element in detail. There was consensus to take a different approach to facilitate completion of preparing preliminary goals and policies. It was agreed that our consultants and staff would prepare preliminary language and supply a draft to the committee well before the next regularly scheduled meeting in September with the overall intent to reach consensus on a DRAFT goals and policy section of the revised SMP.

PURPOSE

The purpose of developing goals and policies is to use them as a framework to help guide the City with other shoreline-related tasks, such as drafting new regulations, developing restoration plans, supporting capital improvement plans and generally providing guidance for shoreline related issues.

ACTION/DISCUSSION

Review the preliminary draft of shoreline goals and policies and reach a consensus on a preliminary draft. Please note that as we progress forward into our next tasks, which include assigning shoreline designations and developing regulations, that we can still add to or modify goals and policies contained in this preliminary draft. Often times when a specific objective or regulation details are being discussed it is necessary (and highly recommended) to support it with a policy.

We have prepared a preliminary goal and policy document and to assist the committee we have annotated each of the proposed goals and policies to show its specific source. Our intent in including this annotation is to show the connection between the community meeting comments, comments of the SAC and existing planning documents including our current comprehensive plan.

Some of the key questions posed to the committee at earlier meeting are still applicable to this review and it may be helpful when reviewing the document to consider these questions. They are as follows:

- 1) Does the preliminary goals and policies DRAFT adequately address your vision for Burien's shorelines?
- 2) Do any of the existing goals and policies need to be amended to accurately capture the shoreline vision, issues and/or opportunities?
- 3) Are additional goals and policies needed to address the identified issues and opportunities?

Our objective is to reach consensus on the preliminary DRAFT goals and policy document. If you have any comments please send an e-mail to me at DavidJ@burienwa.gov.

Attachments

1. Burien Shoreline Element, Preliminary Shoreline Master Program Goals and Policies, 8-18-08 DRAFT

2.13 SHORELINE ELEMENT

The Shoreline Master Program goals and policies of this chapter reflect the aspirations and concerns that Burien citizens and stakeholders expressed about the City's shorelines during community and Shoreline Advisory Committee meetings. These goal and policy statements, along with the shoreline land use map, are the foundation for specific guidelines concerning how to regulate and manage activities occurring within the City's shoreline jurisdiction.

The goals and policies contained in this chapter are organized according to the Shoreline Master Program elements set forth by the Washington State Legislature (RCW 90.58.100(2)). *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.1]*

2.13.1 - Goals and Policies Applicable to All Master Program Elements

Goal ALL.1

Develop, implement, and maintain a Shoreline Master Program that results in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions and processes, balances public and private interests in the shoreline, and considers other relevant programs. [Adapted from Ecology SMP Guidelines, SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)2, and City of Burien Comp. Plan Policy LU 1.7]

- Pol. ALL 1.1 The Shoreline Master Program shall result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions and processes. *[Adapted from Ecology SMP Guidelines]*
- Pol. ALL 1.2 Regulation and management of Burien's shorelines should be informed by ongoing and comprehensive science. *[Adapted from 2007-2009 Puget Sound Conservation and Recovery Plan Priority 8 Long-term goal]*
- Pol. ALL 1.3 The City should be proactive in managing activities within the shoreline jurisdiction. *[SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)2]*
- Pol. ALL 1.4 Implement an adaptive management approach to respond to changes and to ensure continued effectiveness. *[WRIA 9 Objective]*
- Pol. ALL 1.5 The Shoreline Master Program should balance private use and enjoyment of tidelands and adjacent lands with the greater public benefit that shorelines provide, while recognizing the rights of individuals to use and develop private property in a manner consistent with City and other applicable regulations. *[Adapted from SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)2 and City of Burien Comp. Plan Policy LU 1.7]*
- Pol. ALL 1.6 When Shoreline Master Program regulations are developed and applied, they should consider site-specific characteristics. *[Adapted from SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)2]*
- Pol. ALL 1.7 Regulation and management of the City's shorelines should be coordinated with relevant local, state, federal, and other programs. Such programs include, but are not limited to, those administered by: City of Seattle, City of Normandy Park, City of SeaTac, King County, Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Natural Resources, Puget Sound Partnership, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Muckleshoot Tribe, Puyallup Tribe, and Water Resource Inventory Area 9. *[Adapted from Ecology SMP Guidelines]*
- Pol. ALL 1.8 When drafting new regulations the City should consider an incentive base system to encourage redevelopment projects to comply with current shoreline best management practices and standards. *[Adapted from SAC Meeting #2 (5),4]*

2.13.2 - Economic Development Master Program Element

Goal ED.1

Insure healthy, orderly economic growth by allowing those economic activities which will be an asset to the local economy and which result in the least possible adverse effect on the quality of the shoreline and surrounding environment. [1994 SMP Handbook Goal 2 of 9, SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)4]

- Pol. ED 1.1 New commercial development in the shoreline area should be limited to water-oriented uses that can exist harmoniously with surrounding land uses. *[Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Parking Policy 3 of 3, SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)4]*
- Pol. ED 1.2 Protect the beauty and function of the natural environment to maintain a community where workers want to live and work. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. ED 8.6]*
- Pol. ED 1.3 Promote actions ensuring a clean and attractive community. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. ED 11.4]*
- Pol. ED 1.4 Provide high quality customer service and an equitable and efficient development review/land use permitting process. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. ED 9.3]*

2.13.3 - Public Access Master Program Element

Goal PA.1

Increase and enhance public access to shoreline areas, consistent with the natural shoreline character, private rights, and public safety. [Burien Comp Plan Goal SA.1]

- Pol. PA 1.1 Developments, uses, and activities on or near the shoreline should not impair or detract from the public's access to the water. [1994 SMP Handbook Policy 2 of 9]
- Pol. PA 1.2 Publicly owned shorelines should be limited to water-dependent or public recreational uses, otherwise such shorelines should remain protected open space. [1994 SMP Handbook Policy 4 of 9]
- Pol. PA 1.3 Public access to the City's shorelines should be designed to provide for public safety and to minimize potential impacts to private property and individual privacy. [Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.6]
- Pol. PA 1.4 Public access should be provided as close as possible to the water's edge without adversely affecting a sensitive environment and should be designed for handicapped and physically impaired persons. [1994 SMP Handbook Policy 3 of 9]
- Pol. PA 1.5 The City should seek opportunities to develop new public access areas in locations dispersed throughout the shoreline through:
- a. Tax-title properties;
 - b. Donations of land and waterfront areas; and
 - c. Acquisition using grants and bonds. [Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.4 and SAC Meeting #3]
- Pol. PA 1.6 The vacation or sale of street ends, other public right of ways and tax title properties that abut shoreline areas shall be prohibited. The City should protect these areas for public access and public viewpoints. [Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.10]
- Pol. PA 1.7 Waterfront street ends should be recognized as:
- a. An important community resource that provides visual and physical access to the Puget Sound;
 - b. Special use parks which serve the community, yet fit and support the character of the surrounding neighborhoods;
 - c. A destination resource, where limited facilities and enhancements are provided. [Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.1]
- Pol. PA 1.8 The City should manage and develop waterfront street ends by:
- a. Supporting their use by residents city-wide, yet ensuring that the street ends and their supporting facilities are developed at a level or capacity which are appropriate to the neighborhood character, promotes safety, and is consistent with City risk management practices;
 - b. Ensuring that a minimal amount of public parking is available, and that any new parking facilities developed would be harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood;

- c. Ensuring that the waterfront street ends are preserved and maintained with limited enhancements, such as places to sit or rest which fit in with the natural character of the area;
- d. Installing signs that indicate the public's right of access and encourage appropriate use;
- e. Installing limited trail improvements and enhancements to allow access to the water;
- f. Minimizing the potential impacts associated with their use on adjacent private property; and
- g. Developing a street ends plan that promotes waterfront access. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.2]*

Pol. PA 1.9 Waterfront street ends or other shoreline access should be planned in conjunction with the affected neighborhoods. However, the broader community should be notified during the public notification process. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.3]*

Pol. PA 1.10 The City should disseminate information that identifies all locations for public access to the shorelines. *[Adapted from City of Edmonds SMP Policy 2]*

Pol. PA 1.11 The public's visual access to the City's shorelines from streets, paths, trails and designated viewing areas should be conserved and enhanced. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.7]*

Pol. PA 1.12 Public views from the shoreline upland areas should be enhanced and conserved, while recognizing that enhancement of views should not be necessarily construed to mean removal of vegetation. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. SA 1.8]*

Pol. PA 1.13 Promote a coordinated system of connected pathways, sidewalks, passageways between buildings, beach walks, and shoreline access points that increase the amount and diversity of opportunities for walking and chances for personal discoveries. *[Adapted from Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.5.3]*

[Please note: The following goals and policies are recommended by both staff and our consultant team.]

2.13.4 – Recreation Master Program Element

Goal REC.1

Develop a well-maintained, interconnected system of multi-functional parks, recreation facilities, and open spaces that: is attractive, safe, and accessible for all geographic regions and population segments within the City; supports the community's well-established neighborhoods and small town atmosphere; and does not adversely impact shoreline ecological functions and processes. [Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Goal PRO.1 and 1994 SMP Handbook Goal 1 of 6]

- Pol. REC 1.1 Recreation facilities in the shoreline area should be restricted to those dependent upon a shoreline location, or those benefiting from a shoreline or in-water location that are in the public interest. *[City of Edmonds SMP Policy 5]*
- Pol. REC 1.2 Recreational developments should be located, designed and operated to be compatible with, and minimize adverse impacts on, environmental quality and valuable natural features as well as on adjacent surrounding land and water uses. Favorable consideration should be given to proposals which complement their environment and surrounding land and water uses, and which leave natural areas undisturbed and protected. *[1994 SMP Handbook Policy 4 of 16]*
- Pol. REC 1.3 Public information and education programs, and attendant enforcement procedures, should be developed and implemented to help ensure that the public is aware of park regulations and private property rights, and to prevent the abuse of the shoreline and its natural ecological system. *[City of Edmonds SMP Policy 7]*
- Pol. REC 1.4 The City shall plan to provide, in coordination with other agencies, a range of park facilities that serve a variety of recreational and open space purposes. Such planning should use the following designations and guidelines to provide such diversity:

1. Mini or Pocket Park

Use Description: Passive recreation or specialized facilities that *may* serve a concentrated or limited population such as children or senior citizens.

Service area: Approximately 1/3 of a mile radius.

Size: No minimum to approximately one acre.

Desirable Characteristics: These parks should be in close proximity to dwellings and or other centers of activity. Mini parks should be designed for intensive use and should be accessible and visible from surrounding area.

Examples: In Burien these types of parks are primarily private parks consisting of beach access for adjacent subdivisions, view appreciation areas (bench or platform), picnic tables and trees in a small area, children's play area, game tables, or planted areas.

Other Considerations: Since maintenance costs of these smaller parks are high relative to their service areas, few jurisdictions are able to meet the desired quantity. This type of park is most suitable to provide unique local needs, such as shore access, or as a consideration in the design of new development. The City should seek a variety of means for financing and maintaining mini-parks, including considering opportunities for community stewardship and grant or private funding. [Burien Comp Plan Pol. PRO 1.5]

2. Regional Parks

Use Description: Areas of natural or ornamental quality for outdoor recreation such as picnicking, boating, beach activities, swimming, and trails. Such parks may contain special amenities, facilities or features that attract people from throughout the surrounding region. Such facilities require extensive on-site parking and good access by automobile.

Service area: Approximately 1/2 to 1 hour driving time.

Size: Approximately 90 acres.

Desirable Characteristics: Contiguous to or encompassing significant natural resources.

Examples: Seahurst Park.

3. Special Use Park

Use Description: Specialized or single-purpose recreational activities such as walking and bicycle trails, street ends, or areas that preserve buildings, sites or features of historical significance.

Service area: Variable.

Size: Depends on nature of facility.

Desirable Characteristics: Compatibility with adjacent facilities and uses.

Examples: Examples within Burien shoreline consist primarily of designated view points and historical markers, and waterfront street ends (including those at SW 170th Pl., SW 163rd Pl., and at the intersection of Maplewild Ave. SW and SW 172nd St.).

4. Conservancy Park

Use Description: Conservancy parks are formally designated public resource areas. In such parks the primary management objectives are protection and management of historical, cultural and natural resources, including fish and wildlife habitat areas and may include appropriate passive recreational activities.

Service area: None.

Size: As appropriate for the resource.

Desirable Characteristics: As appropriate for the resource.

Examples: Currently Salmon Creek Ravine is most appropriately classified in this category although its feasibility for including other types of park activities consistent with its character should be evaluated. This category would also apply to any significant formally designated land, protected wetlands or steep slope areas by private or public means. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan PRO 1.5]*

- Pol. REC 1.5 Access for motorized vessels should be discouraged at Seahurst Park. Access for non-motorized craft should be considered if access for such craft can be provided in an environmentally-sensitive manner. *[SAC Meeting #3]*
- Pol. REC 1.6 Where appropriate, recreational developments should make adequate provisions for:
- a. Vehicular and pedestrian access, both on-site and off-site;
 - b. Proper water supply and sewage waste disposal methods;
 - c. Security and fire protection;
 - d. The prevention of overflow and trespass onto adjacent properties, including but not limited to landscaping, fencing and posting of property; and
 - e. Buffering of such development from adjacent private property or natural area. *[1994 SMP Handbook Policy 15 of 16]*
- Pol. REC 1.7 Trails and pathways on steep shoreline bluffs should be located, designed and maintained to protect bank stability. *[1994 SMP Handbook Policy 16 of 16]*
- Pol. REC 1.8 Mooring buoys, in general, are beneficial in enabling increased recreational opportunities. However, the City should ensure that their possible negative effects on physical and visual environments are avoided. *[SAC Meeting #3]*
- Pol. REC 1.9 Artificial marine life habitats should be encouraged in order to provide increased aquatic life for recreation. Such habitats should be constructed in areas of low habitat diversity and in consultation with the Department of Fisheries. *[1994 SMP Handbook Policy 11 of 16]*
- Pol. REC 1.10 The linkage of shoreline parks, recreation areas and public access points with linear systems, such as hiking paths, bicycle paths, easements and /or scenic drives, should be encouraged. *[1994 SMP Handbook Policy 8 of 16]*
- Pol. REC 1.11 Development of recreational facility along City shorelines should implement Low Impact Development techniques whenever feasible. *[City of Bellingham Draft SMP Recreation Policy 2.b]*

2.13.5 - Circulation Master Program Element

Goal CI.1

Provide safe, reasonable, and adequate circulation systems in the shoreline area that will have the least possible adverse effect on unique or fragile shoreline features and existing ecological systems, while contributing to the functional and visual enhancement of the shoreline. [Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Goal 1 of 8]

- Pol. CI 1.1 Minimize impacts to the topography and other natural characteristics of the shoreline by appropriately locating transportation routes. New roadways for vehicle circulation should be located outside of or minimized within the shoreline area. *[Adapted from Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.4.2 and Bellingham Draft SMP Circulation Objective 2a]*
- Pol. CI 1.2 Bridges should be prohibited within the Burien shoreline jurisdiction. *[SAC Meeting #2]*
- Pol. CI 1.3 Provide and/or enhance physical and visual public access along shoreline public roads and trails when appropriate given topography, views, natural features, and surrounding land uses. *[Adapted from Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.4.3]*
- Pol. CI 1.4 Public transit systems should provide service to designated shoreline public access points. *[Adapted from City of Edmonds SMP Policy 9 and SAC Meeting #3]*
- Pol. CI 1.5 Wherever practicable, safe pedestrian and bicycle movement on and off roadways in the shoreline area should be encouraged as a means of personal transportation and recreation. *[City of Edmonds SMP Policy 2]*
- Pol. CI 1.6 Parking in shoreline areas should directly serve a permitted shoreline use. *[1994 SMP Handbook Parking Policy 1 of 3]*
- Pol. CI 1.7 Parking facilities should be located and designed to minimize adverse impacts, including those related to: stormwater runoff; water quality; visual qualities; public access; and vegetation and habitat maintenance. *[Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Parking Policy 2 of 3]*
- Pol. CI 1.8 Parking should be planned to achieve optimum use. Where possible, parking should serve more than one use. *[Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Parking Policy 3 of 3]*
- Pol. CI 1.9 Utilities are necessary to serve shoreline uses and should be properly installed so as to protect the shoreline and water from contamination and degradation. *[1994 SMP Handbook Utilities Policy 1 of 3]*
- Pol. CI 1.10 Utility facilities and right-of-ways should be located outside of the shoreline area to the maximum extent possible. When utility lines require a shoreline location, they should be placed underground. *[1994 SMP Handbook Utilities Policy 2 of 3]*
- Pol. CI 1.11 Utility facilities should be designed and located in a manner which preserves the natural landscape and shoreline ecology and minimizes conflicts with present and planned land uses. *[1994 SMP Handbook Utilities Policy 3 of 3]*

2.13.6 - Use Master Program Element

Goal USE.1

Provide functional and attractive shoreline uses that are appropriate in scale, configuration, and location, and are sensitive to and do not degrade habitat and ecological systems and other shoreline resources. [Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. BU 1.1 and 1994 SMP Handbook Goal 1 of 10]

- Pol. USE 1.1 The Shoreline Master Program shall govern the development of all designated shorelines of the City. Lands adjacent to these areas shall be managed in a manner consistent with the Shoreline Master Program. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.5]*
- Pol. USE 1.2 The City will strive to ensure that basic community values are reflected in the City's land use and decision making processes, while recognizing the rights of individuals to use and develop private property in a manner consistent with City regulations. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. LU 1.7]*
- Pol. USE 1.3 Ensure the appropriate location, design, and operation of all activities, development, and redevelopment in the shoreline. *[Adapted from Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.2.4]*
- Pol. USE 1.4 Incentives should be available to encourage the removal and/or reduction of non-conformances. *[Adapted from SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)4]*
- Pol. USE 1.5 Faulty septic systems should be replaced with hook-up to the sanitary sewer system if available. *[SAC Meeting #3]*
- Pol. USE 1.6 Any existing single-family lot that was legally subdivided or legally created prior to enactment of subdivision statutes prior to incorporation or annexation shall be considered a legally conforming lot for building purposes, providing the size of the lot was not reduced by more than 50 percent through acquisition for public purposes, and on such lots new homes may be built and existing houses may be expanded and remodeled, provided that applicable setbacks, lot coverage, critical area restrictions, design review requirements (if any), height limits and other applicable regulations in the zoning code are met. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. RE 1.3]*
- Pol. USE 1.8 When determining buildable lot size for residential development, the area of a lot covered by water (including but not limited to lakes or the Puget Sound) shall not be included in the calculation. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. RE 1.4]*
- Pol. USE 1.9 The planned densities for single-family development should encourage a lower development potential in areas with development constraints. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. RE 1.2]*
- Pol. USE 1.10 The *Low Density Residential Neighborhood* designation will provide for low-density residential development. Development within this designation includes existing neighborhoods that are zoned for four units per acre or less.

Allowed Uses and Description: The *Low Density Residential Neighborhood* designation allows single family residential uses and their accessory uses at a density of 4 units per acre or less, due to the constraints posed by critical areas.

This policy may be implemented by more than one zoning category, based on the ability of the land and public facilities to support development. Development standards, for such items as impervious surfaces, streetscapes, sidewalks and stormwater drainage, may vary within each zoning category based on the existing character of the area.

Designation Criteria: Properties designated *Low Density Residential Neighborhood* should reflect the following criteria:

1. The area is already generally characterized by single-family residential development at four units per acre or less; and
2. Relative to other residential areas within the City, the area is characterized by lower intensity development as shown on Map LU-2.
3. The land is designated as a potential landslide hazard area, steep slope area, or wetland on the City of Burien's Critical Areas Map,
4. The existing and planned public facilities for the area cannot adequately support a higher density.
5. The area is subject to existing impacts from high levels of airport-related noise. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. RE 1.5]*

Pol. USE 1.11 Clustering of housing units may be allowed on lots designated for residential development that contains steep slopes and are located adjacent to an urban environment. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.6]*

Pol. USE 1.12 As slope increases, development intensity, site coverage, and vegetation removal should decrease and thereby minimize the potential for drainage problems, soil erosion, siltation and landslides. Slopes of 40 percent or greater should be retained in a natural state, free of structures and other land surface modifications.

1. Single-family homes and detached single-family garages on existing legally established lots are exempted from this restriction, provided that:
 - a. The application of this restriction would deny any appropriate use of this property;
 - b. There is no other appropriate economic use with less impact;
 - c. The proposed development does not pose a threat to public health, safety or welfare on or off the development site;
 - d. Any alterations permitted to the critical area shall be the minimum necessary to allow for economic use of the property;
 - e. An analysis of soils, footings and foundations, and drainage be prepared by qualified professionals, certifying that the proposed activity is safe and will not adversely affect the steep slope hazard area or buffer; and
 - f. There are adequate plans, as determined by the City, for stormwater and vegetation management.
 - g. Short plats or other divisions of an existing legal lot shall only be approved if all resulting lots are buildable under this restriction.
 - h. It is the applicant's responsibility to show that these provisions are met through an appropriate mechanism such as, or similar to, the SEPA process.
2. Short plats or other divisions of an existing legal lot shall only be approved if all resulting lots are buildable under this restriction.

3. It is the applicant's responsibility to show that these provisions are met through an appropriate mechanism such as, or similar to, the SEPA process. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.1]*

- Pol. USE 1.13 The City should prohibit development on areas prone to erosion and landslide hazards. Further, the City should restrict development on potentially unstable land to ensure public safety and conformity with existing natural constraints, unless the risks and adverse impacts associated with such development can be appropriately mitigated. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.2]*
- Pol. USE 1.14 Land uses on steep slopes should be designed to prevent property damage and environmental degradation, and to enhance open space and wildlife habitat. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.5]*
- Pol. USE 1.15 Where there is a high probability of erosion, grading should be kept to a minimum and disturbed vegetation should be restored as soon as feasible. In all cases, the City shall require appropriate site design and construction measures to control erosion and sedimentation. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.6]*
- Pol. USE 1.16 City should have development standards that promote the siting of new structures such that they will not require shoreline stabilization and protective measures in the future. *[SAC Meeting #3]*
- Pol. USE 1.17 Shoreline stabilization and protective measures should be limited in number and extent. The use of "soft" stabilization and protective measures, such as vegetation, is preferred over the use of "hard" measures, such as concrete bulkheads. *[City of Edmonds Draft SMP Policy 12]*
- Pol. USE 1.18 Encourage joint-use activities in proposed shoreline developments. *[1994 SMP Handbook Goal 7 of 10]*
- Pol. USE 1.19 Wakes generated by vessels operating in the shoreline area should be minimized in order to reduce adverse impacts on the shoreline environment. *[SAC Meeting #3]*

2.13.7 - Conservation Master Program Element

Goal CON.1

Preserve and enhance shoreline natural resources in order to: protect public health, safety, and welfare; maintain the integrity of the natural environment; and preserve the quality of life in Burien. [Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Goal EV.1 and EV.2]

General

- Pol. CON 1.1 Protect critical areas and shoreline ecological processes and functions through regulatory and non-regulatory means. Protection may include acquisition of key properties, regulation of development, and incentives to encourage ecologically sound design. *[Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.7.1]*
- Pol. CON 1.2 The City shall ensure that uses and development in shoreline areas is compatible with the shoreline environments designated in this Shoreline Master Program. Adherence to these designations will ensure that sensitive habitat, ecological systems, and other shoreline resources are protected. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.1]*
- Pol. CON 1.3 The City of Burien's Critical Areas Map shall be used as a reference for identifying the City's critical areas. Other unmapped critical areas do exist throughout the City. Any site containing critical areas are subject to the special development regulations and conditions found in the City's Critical Areas Ordinance. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.1]*
- Pol. CON 1.4 Development should be directed toward areas where their adverse impacts on critical areas can be minimized. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.2]*
- Pol. CON 1.5 New development or redevelopment should avoid or mitigate additional loss of shoreline ecological functions. Redevelopment should be encouraged to improve ecological functions and restore riparian buffers. *[City of Edmonds Draft SMP Policy 5, City of Bellingham Draft SMP Economic Development Policy 1, and SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)4]*
- Pol. CON 1.6 The City shall maintain a system of development regulations and a permitting system to prevent the destruction of critical areas. Development regulations should at a minimum address wetland protection, aquifer recharge areas important for potable water, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.3]*
- Pol. CON 1.7 The City shall require permit review approval before any activity or construction is allowed to occur in, adjacent to, or impact a critical area. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.4]*
- Pol. CON 1.8 The City shall develop land use regulations to buffer critical areas from the impacts of adjacent land uses. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.7]*
- Pol. CON 1.9 The City requires the use of Best Available Science for protecting critical areas within the community pursuant to the Growth Management Act [RCW 36.70A.172(1)]. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.8]*

- Pol. CON 1.10 The City should provide education and technical assistance on low-impact development techniques. *[SAC Meeting #2 Summary (5)4]*
- Pol. CON 1.11 Provide public outreach and education about shoreline ecological functions and processes, and engage the public in stewardship and enhancement activities. *[Adapted from WRIA 9 Objective]*

Water

- Pol. CON 1.11 Encourage minimizing the amount of impervious surfaces in new development through the use of appropriate low-impact development techniques and removing paved areas or using retrofit options in existing developments, where applicable, to minimize runoff. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.9]*
- Pol. CON 1.12 The City shall consider the impacts of new development on water quality as part of its environmental review process and require where appropriate any mitigation measures. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.4]*
- Pol. CON 1.13 Educate the public on water quality issues and impacts of stormwater flow. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.15]*
- Pol. CON 1.14 Educate individuals and households about different ways to reduce pollution. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.16]*

Wetlands

- Pol. CON 1.15 If no feasible alternative exists, a limited amount of development may occur on wetlands and floodplains. In these instances, a broad range of site planning techniques should be explored to minimize impacts on these critical areas. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 1.5]*
- Pol. CON 1.16 All wetland functions should be considered in evaluating wetland mitigation proposals, including fish and wildlife habitat, flood storage, water quality, recreation, educational opportunities, and aesthetics. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 6.2]*
- Pol. CON 1.17 The City will protect wetlands by maximizing infiltration opportunities and promoting the conservation of forest cover and native vegetation. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 6.3]*
- Pol. CON 1.18 Mitigation for any adverse impacts on wetlands shall be provided in the same basin within which the impacts occur. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 6.4]*

Habitat

- Pol. CON 1.19 The City shall consider the impacts of new development on the quality of land, wildlife and vegetative resources as a part of its environmental review process and require any appropriate mitigating measures. Such mitigation may involve the retention of significant habitats. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.9]*
- Pol. CON 1.20 The City shall encourage an increase in tree canopies through the addition and the preservation of existing vegetation and use of landscaping as an integral part of development plans. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.10]*

- Pol. CON 1.21 The City should require development proposals to include measures to stabilize soils, hillsides, bluffs and ravine sidewalls and to promote wildlife habitat by retaining or restoring native vegetation. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.3]*
- Pol. CON 1.22 The City should consider developing policies that balance the removal of vegetation to preserve and enhance views with the need to retain vegetation to promote slope stability and open space. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 3.4]*
- Pol. CON 1.23 Enhance riparian vegetation to improve shoreline ecological functions and processes where possible. *[Adapted from WRIA 9 Objective]*
- Pol. CON 1.24 The City should maintain and enhance existing species and habitat diversity including fish and wildlife habitat that supports the greatest diversity of native species. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.1]*
- Pol. CON 1.25 All development activities shall be located, designed, constructed and managed to avoid disturbance of adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources, including spawning, nesting, rearing and habitat areas and migratory routes. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.2]*
- Pol. CON 1.26 Fish and wildlife habitat should be protected, conserved and enhanced, including:
- Habitats for species which have been identified as endangered, threatened, or sensitive by the state or federal government;
 - Priority species and habitats listed in the Adopted King County Comprehensive Plan, November 1994;
 - Commercial and recreational shellfish areas;
 - Kelp and eel-grass beds;
 - Herring and smelt spawning areas; and
 - Wildlife habitat networks designated by the City. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.3]*
- Pol. CON 1.27 Fish and wildlife should be maintained through conservation and enhancement of terrestrial, air and aquatic habitats. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.4]*
- Pol. CON 1.28 The City should ensure that habitat networks throughout the City are designated and mapped. The network should be of sufficient width to protect habitat and dispersal zones for small mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and birds. These networks should be protected through incentives, regulation and other appropriate mechanisms. Site planning should be coordinated during development review to ensure that connections are made or maintained amongst segments of the network. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.7]*
- Pol. USE 1.29 Native plant communities and wildlife habitats shall be integrated with other land uses where possible. Development shall protect wildlife habitat through site design and landscaping. Landscaping, screening, or vegetated buffers required during development review shall retain, salvage and/or reestablish native vegetation whenever feasible. Development within or adjacent to wildlife habitat networks shall incorporate design techniques that protect and enhance wildlife habitat values. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.8]*
- Pol. CON 1.30 In order to minimize adverse impacts related to noise, unless prohibited by federal or state law, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas within the City

should be protected from exterior noise levels which exceed 55 dBA Ldn. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.10]*

Pol. CON 1.31 The City shall promote voluntary wildlife enhancement projects which buffer and expand existing wildlife habitat, through educational and incentive programs for individuals and businesses. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.11]*

Pol. CON 1.32 The City shall seek to retain as open space, those areas that provide essential habitat for any rare, threatened or endangered plant or wildlife species. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. OS 1.2]*

Pol. CON 1.33 The City should maintain, protect and enhance greenbelts riparian corridors and wildlife habit corridors so that the extent and intensity of the built environment is balanced by these natural features. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EQ 1.2]*

Pol. CON 1.34 The City shall work with property owners to encourage non-purchase options such as conservation easements, current use easements, and development covenants to preserve open space and greenbelts within the city's neighborhoods. The City should also accept donations of properties where public access is anticipated or planned. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EQ 1.3]*

2.13.8 Historic, Cultural, Scientific, and Educational Master Program Element

Goal HCSE.1

Identify, protect, preserve, and restore buildings, sites, and areas in the shoreline having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value for educational purposes, scientific endeavors, and enjoyment by the general public. [Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Goal 1 of 3 and Ecology SMP Guidelines]

- Pol. HCSE 1.1 The City should protect buildings, sites, and areas in the shoreline having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value through designation, acquisition by purchase or gift, and incentives for preservation. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Goal HT 1.1 and 1994 SMP Handbook Goal 2 of 3]*
- Pol. HCSE 1.2 Ensure that properties having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value are protected from undue adverse impacts associated with public or private uses and activities. *[Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Policy 1 of 1 and Burien Comp Plan Goal HT.1]*
- Pol. HCSE 1.3 The City should consider developing and implementing measures which preserve trees of historical significance. *[Burien Comp Plan Goal EV 2.11]*
- Pol. HCSE 1.4 Encourage educational projects and programs, including signage, that foster a greater appreciation of the importance of buildings, sites, and areas in the shoreline having historic, cultural, scientific, or educational value; as well as of shoreline management and environmental conservation. *[Adapted from City of Edmonds Draft SMP Policy 3]*

2.13.9 - Flood Prevention and Minimization Master Program Element

Goal FLD.1

Prevent and minimize flood damage to public and private property by locating development away from flood-prone areas and by protecting and restoring shoreline ecological functions and processes. [Adapted from City of Edmonds Draft SMP Flood Damage Prevention Element Goal and City of Bellingham Flood Minimization Goal 1a]

- Pol. FLD 1.1 Discourage new development in shoreline areas that would be harmed by flood conditions, or which would create or intensify flood hazard impacts on other properties. [City of Edmonds Draft SMP Flood Damage Prevention Element Policy 3]
- Pol. FLD 1.2 The capacity of natural drainage courses shall not be diminished by development or other activities. [Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.3]
- Pol. FLD 1.3 New structural flood hazard reduction measures shall only be allowed where demonstrated to be necessary, and when non-structural methods are infeasible and mitigation is accomplished. New structural flood reduction measures shall be located landward of associated wetlands and buffer areas, except where no alternative exists as documented in a geotechnical analysis. [Adapted from DOE SMP Submittal Checklist]
- Pol. FLD 1.4 Monitor sea level rise and accordingly adjust development standards such building setbacks to minimize flooding potential. [Adapted from SAC Meeting #1 Summary (6)1]


2.13.12 - Restoration Master Program Element

Goal REST.1

Restore areas which are ecologically degraded to the greatest extent feasible while maintaining appropriate use of the shoreline. [Adapted from 1994 SMP Handbook Conservation Element Goal 3 of 4]

- Pol. REST 1.1 Promote restoration actions that are doable, practical, and effective. *[Adapted from WRIA 9 Objective]*
- Pol. REST 1.2 The City shall be a good steward of public lands and should integrate restoration and/or enhancement of fish and wildlife habitats into capital improvement projects whenever feasible. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.5]*
- Pol. REST 1.3 Establish incentives that provide opportunities for new development or redevelopment activities in the shoreline to restore impaired ecological functions and processes. Incentives might include, but are not limited to: flexible development standards (e.g. setbacks, height limits, lot coverage), reduced or waiver of permits fees, and tax relief. *[Adapted from City of Edmonds Draft SMP Policy 12 and Port Townsend SMP Policies 4.8.2 and 4.8.3]*
- Pol. REST 1.4 The City shall promote voluntary shoreline enhancement projects through educational and incentive programs for individuals and organizations. *[Adapted from Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 4.11]*
- Pol. REST 1.5 The City should implement the restoration plan associated with this Shoreline Master Program. *[Adapted from Port Townsend SMP Policy 4.8.1]*
- Pol. REST 1.6 Improve natural stream and shoreline conditions to an environmental quality level that supports the return and continuation of salmon runs. *[Adapted from Salmon Creek Neighborhood Plan Goal NE 8.3]*
- Pol. REST 1.7 Eliminate fish blockages. *[Adapted from Salmon Creek Neighborhood Plan Goal NE 8.1]*
- Pol. REST 1.8 Stream banks and stream channels should be maintained or restored to their natural condition wherever such conditions or opportunities exist. *[Burien Comp Plan Pol. EV 2.2]*
- Pol. REST 1.9 Increase availability of large woody debris and opportunities for recruitment in the nearshore zone. *[City of Edmonds Draft SMP Policy 5]*
- Pol. REST 1.10 Restore degraded shoreline areas with native species. *[Adapted from Salmon Creek Neighborhood Plan Goal NE 8.5]*
- Pol. REST 1.11 The City should investigate partnerships with local environmental groups, city, state or county agencies, or tribes to implement projects and conduct follow-up monitoring and reporting.

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON
MEMORANDUM**

DATE: September 2, 2008
TO: Burien Shoreline Advisory Committee
FROM: David Johanson, AICP, Senior Planner 
SUBJECT: Burien Shoreline Master Program Environment Designations

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Shoreline Advisory Committee a draft of the proposed shoreline environment designations. Consistent with the state guidelines for preparing shoreline master programs, the document includes a purpose, criteria and management policies for each of the three proposed designations: Aquatic, Urban Conservancy, and Shoreline Residential.

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

Shoreline environment designations are a required part of a shoreline master program that provide a policy and geographic framework to help guide the City in evaluating proposed activities and permit applications in the City's shoreline jurisdiction. The guidelines (WAC 173-26-211 (4) (b)) recommend a classification system with six basic environments: "High-Intensity," "Shoreline Residential," "Urban Conservancy," "Rural Conservancy," "Natural," and "Aquatic". Staff and the consultants have evaluated these designations for potential application to the Burien shoreline jurisdiction. Several of the designations match the existing land uses and intensity of development and are consistent with the current shoreline environment designations. In addition, the shoreline characterization and analysis of ecological conditions and functions was also referred to in selecting appropriate environment designations.

ACTION/DISCUSSION

The Shoreline Advisory Committee is requested to review and comment on the preliminary draft of the shoreline environment designations document including the purpose, criteria for designation, and management policies for each of the designations. Staff is looking for your guidance on assigning the designations to the shoreline reaches.

Some of the key questions to consider are:

- 1) Do the proposed designations and management policies accurately reflect Burien's shorelines?

2) Are the proposed shoreline environment designations consistent with the comprehensive plan designations and implementing zoning?

3) How should institutional uses (i.e., Ruth Dykeman facility) be addressed?

ATTACHMENTS

1. City of Burien Shoreline Master Program—Shoreline Environment Designations (Draft), 8/20/08

City of Burien Shoreline Master Program Shoreline Environment Designations

August 20, 2008

Shorelines of Statewide Significance

The State of Washington Shoreline Management Act (SMA) designates certain shoreline areas as shorelines of statewide significance. These shorelines are considered important major resources from which all people in the state derive benefit. The SMA states that local shoreline master programs must give preference to uses which favor public and long-term interests of the people of the state. In the City of Burien, the marine shorelines are designated shorelines of statewide significance. The following policies apply to Burien's marine shorelines:

- Recognize and protect the statewide interest over local interest.
- Preserve the natural character of the shoreline.
- Result in long-term over short-term benefit.
- Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline.
- Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shoreline.
- Increase recreational opportunities for the public on the shoreline.

Aquatic

Purpose

The purpose of the "Aquatic" shoreline environment designation is to protect, restore, and manage the unique characteristics and resources of shoreline areas waterward of the ordinary high water mark by managing water-dependent uses and modifications to prioritize preservation and restoration of critical saltwater habitat and overall ecological functions of the nearshore area, navigation and recreation, by assuring compatibility between shoreland and aquatic uses.

Criteria for Designation

An Aquatic shoreline environment designation will be assigned to lands waterward of the ordinary high water mark for both saltwater and freshwater bodies of water, including any submerged or inter-tidal areas. For the City of Burien, this designation applies to Lake Burien and all marine (Puget Sound) areas waterward of the ordinary high water mark out to the center of the channel within the City limits. The Aquatic shoreline environment designation includes the water surface together with the underlying lands and the water column.

Management Policies

1. Shoreline uses and modifications should be compatible with the adjoining shoreline environment and designed and managed to prevent degradation of water quality and alteration of natural hydrographic conditions.
2. New overwater structures should be allowed only for water-dependent uses, public access, or ecological restoration if it can be clearly shown that the cumulative environmental impacts of such structures will not cause significant adverse impacts to protected species.
3. The size of new overwater structures should be limited to the minimum necessary to support the structure's intended use and should support multiple uses.
4. All developments and uses on navigable waters or their beds should be located and designed to minimize interference with surface navigation and moorage.
5. All developments and uses should consider impacts to public views and access and allow for the safe, unobstructed passage of fish and wildlife, particularly those species dependent on migration.
6. Restoration opportunities associated with project impacts should be encouraged in the aquatic environment.
7. Uses that adversely impact the ecological functions of critical saltwater and freshwater habitats should not be allowed except where necessary to achieve the objectives of RCW 90.58.020, and then only when their impacts are mitigated according to the sequence described in WAC 173-26-201(2)(e) necessary to achieve no net loss of ecological functions.
8. Dredging and dredge material disposal should be limited to the minimum amount necessary. Dredging operations should minimize impacts to other shoreline uses and functions.
9. Filling should be limited to the minimum amount necessary. Filling operations should minimize impacts to other shoreline uses and functions.
10. Ensure that marinas are located, designed, constructed, and operated in a manner that will minimize damage to shoreline processes and functions, be compatible with adjacent uses, and protect the aesthetic qualities of the shoreline environment.

Urban Conservancy

Purpose

The purpose of the "Urban Conservancy" shoreline environment designation is to protect and restore ecological functions of open space, floodplains, and other sensitive lands where they exist in urban and developed settings, while allowing a variety of compatible uses. This designation focuses on providing public access for the enjoyment of marine and lake shorelines by allowing development of public recreational facilities.

Criteria for Designation

An "Urban Conservancy" environment designation will be assigned to areas within shoreline jurisdiction that are suitable for public access, water-enjoyment recreational uses and active recreation developments. These are areas that are developed at a low density including residential and outdoor recreation uses.

Management Policies

1. Uses that preserve or restore the natural character of the shoreline area or promote preservation of open space and critical areas should be the primary allowed uses.
2. Public access and public recreation objectives should be implemented if feasible and wherever any significant ecological impacts can be mitigated.
3. Water-oriented uses should be given priority over non-water-oriented uses with water-dependent uses given the highest priority.
4. New development should be designed and located to preclude the need for shoreline armoring, vegetation removal, flood control, and other shoreline modifications.
5. Standards should be established for shoreline stabilization measures, vegetation conservation, water quality, and shoreline modifications. These standards shall ensure that new development does not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions or further degrade other shoreline values.

Shoreline Residential

Purpose

The purpose of the shoreline residential environment is to accommodate residential development and appurtenant structures as well provide appropriate public access.

Criteria for Designation

A "shoreline residential" shoreline environment designation will be assigned to shoreline areas that are predominantly single-family or multifamily residential development or are planned and platted for residential development. These are areas that are developed at a moderate density or intensity including residential and outdoor recreation uses.

Management Policies

1. Residential and accessory uses, recreation facilities and public access shall be the preferred uses.
2. Multifamily and multi-lot residential and recreational developments should provide public access and joint use for community recreational facilities.
3. Water-oriented recreational uses should be allowed.
4. Any new development or redevelopment should utilize low impact development techniques where feasible.
5. Standards for density or minimum frontage width, setbacks, lot coverage limitations, buffers, shoreline stabilization, vegetation conservation, critical area protection, and water quality shall be set to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

David Johanson

From: David Johanson
nt: Monday, August 18, 2008 2:11 PM
Dan Bath; Annie Phillips (felicity@nwlinc.com); Bob Fritzen (BFRI461@ECY.WA.GOV); Brian Bennett (bcbennett@hotmail.com); Bruce Berglund (bberggo@peoplepc.com); Cyrilla Cook (ccook@pugetsound.org); Don Warren (donwarren@seanet.com); Emelie McNett (emelie@psmt.biz); George Yocum (gyocum@pacifictorque.com); Jim Branson (james.branson.206@gmail.com); Joe Fitzgibbon (jcfitzgibbon@gmail.com); Joe Weiss (weiss_joe@msn.com); Kim Otto (kotto444@hotmail.com); Lee Moyer (MoyerLA@aol.com); Patrick Haugen (path41@msn.com); Rebecca McInteer (mcinteer@drizzle.com); Victoria Hall (victoriachall2@yahoo.com)
Cc: (kstewart@reidmiddleton.com)
Subject: Burien Shoreline Master Program Preliminary Goals and Policies
Attachments: Memo to SAC on PoliciesContMtg4.DOC; Preliminary Goals and Policies 081808.doc; Shoreline Related Web Links.doc

Dear Shoreline Advisory Committee Members

At our last Shoreline Advisory Committee meeting we stated that we would provide a copy of a preliminary draft of the goals and policies so that members could have ample time to review the document before our next meeting. Please see attached preliminary draft and cover memo. The memo provides background information and more detail on the document itself.

We will be placing this topic on the next meeting agenda for our next Shoreline Advisory Committee Meeting scheduled for September 10, 2008 4-6 pm here at City Hall. Please feel free to give me a call or e-mail me if you have any questions. The complete meeting packet will be sent out the week prior to our meeting date.

There were also a few requests from the committee for related web links to other shoreline topics. I have been collecting various web links that the committee may find useful. There is a lot of information out there on the web so this list is by no means exhaustive, but I tried to find sites that were more in line with the issues that we have been discussing. If there are other sites/documents that the group has found particularly useful and/or informative I am more than happy to add them to the list. So for those of you that enjoy reading and researching, enjoy.

David Johanson, AICP
City of Burien, Senior Planner
15811 Ambaum Blvd. SW, Ste. C
Burien, WA 98166-3066

Phone: (206) 248-5522



Shoreline Related Website Links

Shoreline Management Act - <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=90.58>

The Public Trust Doctrine - http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/laws_rules/public_trust.html

Juvenile Pacific Salmon and the Nearshore Ecosystem of Puget Sound -
http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/pacjuv_salmon.pdf

Historic Characterization of WRIA9 Shoreline Landforms -
http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/wria9.pdf

The Geomorphology of Puget Sound Beaches -
http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/geomorphology.pdf

Beaches and Bluffs of Puget Sound and the Northern Straits -
http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/beaches_bluffs.pdf

Ecology Report: What Does No Net Loss Mean in the 2003 SMA Guidelines -
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0406020.html>

Mooring Buoy Registration Brochure - http://www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/aqr_mooring_buoy_brochure.pdf
http://www.dnr.wa.gov/RecreationEducation/HowTo/Homeowners/Pages/aqr_mooring_buoy.aspx

RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY OWNER Mooring Buoy Registration -
http://www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/aqr_mooring_buoy_card.pdf

How do I Authorize my Mooring Buoy? -
http://www.dnr.wa.gov/RecreationEducation/HowTo/Homeowners/Pages/aqr_mooring_buoy.aspx

Shorelands and Environmental Assistance
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/publications.htm>

Protecting Nearshore Habitat and Functions in Puget Sound: An Interim Guide October 2007
http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/nearshore_guidelines

CONFIDENTIAL - SECURITY INFORMATION

Subject: [Illegible]

Reference: [Illegible]

Summary: [Illegible]

Details: [Illegible]

Conclusion: [Illegible]

Recommendations: [Illegible]

Comments: [Illegible]

Signature: [Illegible]

Date: [Illegible]

Location: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Initials: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

Remarks: [Illegible]

✓ Mr. Jim Branson
PO Box 904
Seaburst, WA 98062

✓ Mr. George Yocum
12044 5th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

✓ Mr. Joe Weiss
5041 SW Prince
Seattle, WA 98116

✓ Ms. Kim Otto
12237 2nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98168

✓ Mr. Brian Bennett
12423 14th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98146

✓ Mr. Patrick Haugen
12122 Shorewood Dr SW
Burien, WA 98146

✓ Ms. Cyrilla Cook
911 Western Ave, Suite 580
Seattle, WA 98104

✓ Mr. Lee Moyer
11917 8th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98146

Ms. Victoria Hall
15226 26th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Ms. Emelie McNett
13637 3rd Ave S
Burien, WA 98168

✓ Ms. Annie Phillips *WVNM*
17600 Sylvester Rd SW
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Mr. Don Warren
15702 13th Ave SW
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Mr. Bruce Berglund
15643 Maplewild Ave SW
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Mr. Joe Fitzgibbon
615 SW Ambaum Blvd, #204
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Ms. Rebecca McInteer
2405 SW 151st St
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Mr. Bob Fritzen
Washington State Dept. of Ecology
1440 10th St, Suite 102
Bellingham, WA 98225

✓ Liz *ogawa*
Assistant Planner

✓ Ms. Laura Arber
Washington State Dept. of Fish and
Wildlife
16018 Mill Creek Blvd
Mill Creek, WA 98012

Parks Department

✓ Mr. David Johanson
City of Burien
15811 Ambaum Blvd. SW, Suite C
Burien, WA 98166

✓ Karen Stewart
Senior Planner
Reid Middleton, Inc.
728 134th St SW, Suite 200
Everett, WA 98204

Katie Knight
Puget Sound Habitat Program
Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife
600 Capitol Way North
Olympia, WA 98501-1091

City of Burien, Washington

Shoreline Advisory Committee

Meeting #4 Summary

September 10, 2008
4:00pm

(1) ATTENDANCE

SAC Members present	Technical Staff Present	Interested Parties Present
Bruce Berglund Jim Branson Cyrilla Cook Joe Fitzgibbon Patrick Haugen David Johanson Rebecca McInteer Emelie McNett Lee Moyer Kim Otto Annie Phillips George Yocum Don Warren Joe Weiss	Liz Ockwell Karen Stewart	

(2) CONFIRM AGENDA

1. The agenda was confirmed

(3) REVIEW AND APPROVE MEETING #3 SUMMARY

1. The meeting summary was accepted as presented with a few clarifying comments
 - Clarification regarding idea of making private beaches available to the public, discussion clarified the statement that maybe there is a way for access to be provided by private owners at specific times.
 - Clarification on potential policy about public access and where it should be provided, the idea was to disperse access equally throughout the city to make it more available to all neighborhoods.

(4) SHORELINE GOALS AND POLICIES, Continued DISCUSSION

1. General Policy Language
 - Policy language is "wishy-washy" - Instead of using 'should', 'shall' should be used instead

- Discussed implications of using should vs. shall language
 - Discussion regarding if 'shoreline' be removed from policy language as this document is the Shoreline Master Program
2. 2.13 Shoreline Element
- *Consensus:* Language defining the shoreline jurisdiction should be added to this section
 - *Consensus:* Language should also be added such as from the Port Townsend SMP to clearly state how this SMP refers to Burien specifically
3. Goals and Policies Applicable to All Master Program Elements
- *Consensus:* Pol. ALL 1.2 should be changed to "Regulation and management of Burien's shorelines should be guided ~~informed~~ by ongoing and comprehensive science".
 - *Consensus:* Pol. ALL 1.8 should read "When drafting new regulations the City should consider an incentive base system to encourage redevelopment projects to comply with accepted ~~current~~ shoreline best management practices and standards."
4. Economic Development Master Program Use Element
- Discussion on whether customer service and permitting policies are appropriate in a shoreline document. 5 in favor of keeping 5 in favor of removing.
 - *Consensus:* Was to remove Pol. ED 1.4, however it will remain in city's comp plan but not recommended to be in SMP policies.
5. Public Access Master Program Element
- *Consensus:* Goal PA.1 should read "Increase and enhance public access to shoreline areas, consistent with the natural shoreline character, private property rights, and public safety
 - *Consensus:* Pol. PA 1.8.b should read "Ensuring that ~~a minimal amount of~~ public parking is available, and that any new parking facilities developed would be harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood"
 - *Consensus:* Pol. PA 1.8.c should read "Ensuring that the waterfront street ends are preserved and maintained with limited enhancements, such as places to sit or rest which fit in with the natural environment ~~character~~"
6. Recreation Master Program Element
- *Consensus:* Pol. REC 1.3 should read "Public information and education programs, and relevant

attendant enforcement procedures, should be developed

- *Consensus:* Pol. REC 1.7 should read "Trails and pathways on steep shoreline bluffs should be located, designed and maintained to protect bank stability without need for shoreline armoring"

7. Circulation Master Program Element

- *Consensus:* Pol CI 1.2 should be clarified to read "Cross-sound bridges should be prohibited within the Burien shoreline jurisdiction"
- *Consensus:* Add Pol CI 1.12 to read "Parking for non-water dependent uses should be located as far away as feasible from shorelines"
- *Consensus:* Pol CI 1.9 should read "Utilities are necessary to serve shoreline uses and shall should be properly installed so as to protect the shoreline and water from contamination and degradation"

8. Use Master Program Element

- *Consensus:* Pol CI 1.5 should be rephrased and reworded to read "If feasible, septic systems should be connected to the sanitary sewer system where connections are available"

9. Conservation Master Program Element

- *Consensus:* there should be a new policy that should read
- *Consensus:* Pol. CON 1.21 should be amended to read "The City should require development proposals to include non structural measures to stabilize soils, hillsides, bluffs and ravine sidewalls and to promote wildlife habitat by removing invasive vegetation and retaining or restoring native vegetation"
- *Consensus:* Pol. CON 1.26.c should read "Commercial and recreational Shellfish areas"

10. Restoration Master Program Element

- Formatting error noted in numbering should read 2.13.1042

(5) NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 2009. David Johanson will try and provide a meeting 4 summary and send it to the committee. He will also be incorporating the consensus items in a Preliminary Goals and Policy DRAFT for circulation.

The meeting concluded at 6:05pm.

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...

...the ... of ...